

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Second Session – Twelfth Legislature
7th Day

Friday, February 19, 1954

The House met at three o'clock p.m.

DEBATE ON ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The House resumed, from Thursday, February 18, 1954, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Wooff for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Mrs. Marjorie Cooper (Regina City): - Mr. Speaker, first I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. We found the speeches very interesting and very informative. There was a very delightful contrast between the two speeches, and I am sure we all enjoyed them very much.

I would also like to join with the others in adding my congratulations the hon. member from Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson) on his new and very important position as Leader of the Opposition in this House; and I would like to add my welcome to the two new members in the Legislature. After hearing their speeches, yesterday, we know that they are going to add a good deal to the debates in this House and when we can find a member in the Opposition who takes the trouble to read the 'Regina Manifesto' we have high hopes on this side of the House.

We hear a good deal from the members in the various constituencies about the merits of the constituencies they represent. The hon. member from Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs) was not exactly modest about his constituency, and I do notice that the hon. members from Saskatoon never miss an opportunity to get in a word or two about their city – and I don't blame them, because Saskatoon is rather a nice little city you know; but we will not embarrass them with comparison with the Queen City of the West.

Regina is in a period of great expansion, and the growth of our city is a reflection of the development and the growth throughout this whole province – the developments that were so very well described by the Premier in his speech, the other day. In spite of a record building programme we are short of needed accommodation of almost every sort and now, with the possibility of natural gas in the near future, and with the hope of a more adequate water supply, we are expecting many new industries to locate here and we are looking forward with optimism to our future. In fact, the greatest restraining factor at the present time to further growth in Regina is a desperate shortage of housing accommodation.

I have noticed, Mr. Speaker, that most of the members of this Legislature have a great many requests to the Minister of Highways for roads in this or that part of their constituencies. In my constituency we are unique. All we are asking of the hon. Minister is that he keep his roads out of our city. What we want is a by-pass; it has already been surveyed and I think we are looking forward, in the near future, to its construction.

Reginans are very proud of their city. We are in a period where we are having some growing pains; but we have a group of progressive citizens who, we know, can solve our problems intelligently, and if anyone wants to know how I know they are progressive, just take a look at what they did on August 10th last and on June 11th in 1952.

While there are many aspects of the Government's programme that I would like to talk about this afternoon, I am going to confine myself to two or three things that interest me greatly and a few things that give me a good deal of concern. Over the past few years I have been watching with a good deal of interest the progress of the larger school units in this province. During this past year two new units were organized – one at Canora and one at Moosomin; and we now just have four districts left unorganized. It is gratifying to note that not one unit that has been organized has been disbanded, and to find throughout the country, where the units have been in operation long enough to assess their value, that there is a growing appreciation of the enriched educational opportunities that these larger units can provide.

I have been concerned, as I know all the members of the Legislature have, with our continuing teacher shortage, but it is encouraging to find that, as of October, last year, the enrolment in our teachers' colleges is up 30 from last year and at the College of Education it is up 35. This is not perhaps as great as we might hope for, but at least it is an increase, and we hope the trend will continue. If the plan that is now being proposed by the Trustees' Association in co-operation with the Department of Education and the Teachers' Federation of bringing quite a large number of British teachers here materializes, it should help the situation a good deal. The Department is doing everything in its power to encourage young people to go into the teaching profession, and there is no doubt that our revolving loan fund to help needy students has been of great assistance in recruiting teachers. IN 1953, some 413 students were assisted and of these, 194 students were in the College of Education. I feel that this loan fund is one of the finest things the Government has done.

I would like to call the attention of this Legislature to another very excellent piece of work, this time in the field of Social Welfare, and that is the care that this Department gives to neglected children. I wonder how many of the members realize that we now have 1,100 children in foster homes in this province. It is a tremendous programme, and it has not been achieved without a great deal of painstaking hard work by the officials involved. I had the privilege, recently, of attending a tea given by the Department for the foster mothers in Regina and district, and they were a wonderful group of women. It would have done your heart good to listen to them talking about their foster children, about their little troubles and the cute little sayings of those children just in the same way that all we mothers talk about our children when we get together. There is no more worthwhile work being done anywhere in this community than that of giving a little child a chance to grow up in a normal home environment. No matter how good an institution may be, nothing can take the place of home life for a little child, because it gives them a sense of security and a sense of belonging that nothing else can possibly give. The greatest care is taken by the officials of this Department and by the social workers in the type of home in which a child is placed, and I think the Minister, the staff and the foster mothers themselves deserve the greatest commendation from this Legislature.

I would like to speak for a moment on one aspect of our corrections programme. I have made it a point, Mr. Speaker, both last year and just a few weeks ago, to visit the women's jail in Prince Albert. First I would like to say that, inasmuch as the preset plant permits, this jail has been made attractive and has created an atmosphere in which remedial work can be done. They have an excellent well-qualified staff who are interested in their work; the girls have an excellent teacher and they have regular classes daily. There is quite a good library in the jail and the girls are encouraged to read. There is a nice little hairdressing parlour where they get a chance to learn something about the care of their hair and about personal cleanliness. I saw some of the handwork that was done by these prisoners and it was very well done; and the attractive drapes that are hanging in the dining room and in the front office were woven by the girls themselves. The day I was there the girls were making a quilt for the Red Cross.

One thing I do like is the dining room. It is bright and cheerful and instead of the girls having to eat alone there are nice little chrome tables and the girls gather around them to eat their meals. The cells rather than being a drab colour are of different pastel colours and the halls are a light cream colour – and what a difference a little colour makes! The men could well take note of this; it really makes a very great difference. Of course, inside the bars – there are bars, there are cells and bars; but inside, they are quite well kept, they are clean and they are reasonably attractive. All this is very good and again I say, a very great improvement has been made in the last few years.

There is still a great drawback, however. The fact that the women's jail is in the same building as the men's is not good, and it creates some problems that are difficult. It creates discipline problems that are a little bit unpleasant, and one of the greatest drawbacks is the fact that the meals have to be cooked in the men's section of the jail and they are shoved through a little slot in the wall and the girls get their food there. Most of these girls who are prisoners are not very well educated and their best hope of employment, when they get out, is as a domestic and they are missing the chance of learning to cook. Under the present situation it is hard to keep them as well occupied as we would like to see them, so I would hope that the time may come when we can do something about this problem. I know the expense might seem a little bit too great for the number of girls involved, because there are usually from 20 to 30 girls there; but if we could provide a cottage-type institution for these girls it would suite their needs a little better. The women do not need bars and the kind of an institution that may be necessary for men, and if we had a cottage-type institution of this kind possibly it could also do for girls, who are potential criminals, who are delinquent girls, whom we now have to send to Manitoba and Alberta because there are not enough of them to warrant an institution like that here. They might be accommodated there too. I am pleased to see that the Minister has been giving this matter a good deal of consideration and I know that he will look at all aspects of the problem.

Turning now to the question of health, it is a field in which I am keenly interested. The achievements of this Government in the field of health are so well known and so thoroughly appreciated throughout this province that there is no need for me to dwell too much on this matter.

However, there is one aspect in the field of mental health that I would like to say a little bit about.

We in this province have very good reason to be proud of our mental health programme. I was very pleased to hear Dr. Hinks, one of Canada's greatest experts on mental health when he visited here recently, and I was very pleased to hear the enthusiasm with which he spoke about our mental health programme. We have had very fine tributes from people like Dr. Griffin and Dr. Menninger on the splendid work that is being done in this province. We can say without fear of contradiction that we have one of the finest mental health programmes on this continent.

No matter how good a job you do, however, it seems as though there is always something more that needs to be done; and the better job you do, the more you see what needs to be done. That's the sad part about it; and I am really quite concerned about the overcrowding in our mental hospitals. I know we have done a good deal since this Government came into office to relieve the situation, but the buildings are still housing many more people than they were meant to accommodate. This is not only bad for the patients, it is also difficult for the staff. We have been very fortunate in this province in having such a fine staff and being able to attract leading men in the field of psychiatry, not only from this country but even from England. The reason why they have been willing to come here is because we have been willing to pioneer in this field and to give them every possible co-operation in the work they are doing. But, if we are going to keep good staff of this high caliber we are going to have to deal, as soon as possible, with this business of overcrowding in our mental hospitals.

You know, we would not allow overcrowding in our general hospitals, and there should be no difference between people in mental hospitals and those in general hospitals; the needs of both groups are just the same. The Government has not been unmindful of this problem. They have taken the first steps by building a home for mental defectives in Moose Jaw, and that will relieve the situation greatly when it is ready; but there still will be some overcrowding. I know the Government have this matter in mind and I would urge them – and I do not think I even need to urge them – to give it top priority when new programmes are planned. When we are through with building the home for mental defectives, I know that a good deal of attention will be given to solving this problem. How to solve it, I am not competent to say; but I do know there have been some very interesting experiments in the United States in boarding-home care for patients in mental hospitals, and we might be able to do something along that line.

Then another thing that complicates matters very greatly is the fact that we have so many old people, who are really just merely confused people, in our mental hospitals. If we could find some other way of dealing with this group – could we extend facilities in our general hospitals to meet the problem, or rearrange them, because one of the greatest tragedies for older people is they hate to be uprooted from the communities in which they have lived all their lives and it is hard for their friends and relatives to visit them. Perhaps if we could find a way of hospitalizing them nearer home it might make them happier. We have spent a tremendous amount of money in this province on mental health, but I know the people of the province approve of this expenditure, and I commend the Government on the wonderful work that has been done in this field.

I am not going to speak on housing this afternoon, although I am tremendously interested in the subject. The reason I am not, is because I am going to have a good deal to say about housing a little later on in the form of a resolution. But there is one more matter that I would like to deal with. I would like to commend the Government for setting up in the Department of Social Welfare a Bureau on Alcoholism. I think it is a very forward-looking step, because the alarming rapidity in the rise of liquor sales and the accompanying rise in accidents are not altogether unrelated, and this whole problem of the excessive use of alcohol, and of alcoholism, is causing a great deal of public concern not only in this province but in Canada and in every country in the world. In an age of high-powered motors and paved highways this problem presents a threat to life and to property that can no longer be neglected. So it is time that we gave it our considered thought and action.

You know, it takes a little bit of courage to talk about this problem, because immediately you have anything to say about it and try to deal with it seriously at all, you are placed in the category – I guess the word is ‘fuddy-duddy’ – belonging to a past generation. In fact, I was reading an article in the ‘Leader-Post’ and here is what it has to say. It is the report from the alcoholism survey in Ontario and it describes, typifying the Canadian abstainer, and here is what the description is:

“A female, 50 years and over, Protestant, having less than a high-school education, and living on a farm community under poor circumstances.”

So you know now what category the hon. Premier and I are in. I wouldn’t know about the Leader of the Opposition, but I am quite sure the member from Swift Current (Mr. Gibbs) does not belong in this group.

However, this is a serious problem and it deserves serious treatment, so let us be realistic for a few minutes and try to look some of the facts straight in the face. The consumption of alcoholic beverages in this country has risen at an alarming rate. I have a great many statistics from the Canada Year Book and other sources, but I am not going to weary this House with a lot of statistics. It is enough to say that the sale of spirits has nearly doubled in the last ten years, and the sale of beer – the amount of beer – has doubled. Or, if you wish to have it in dollars and cents: sales of liquor in 1950 (and it has gone up since then) in Canada were \$655 million, which is approximately \$200 a family. It is interesting to note that in the same year we spent \$350 million on education. You know, that \$655 million which we spent on alcohol would have been enough to put in a national health insurance scheme for all of Canada. I believe the amount spent on liquor in this province of Saskatchewan last year, comes to something like \$47 per capita.

Another measure showing the increased consumption of liquor is our liquor profit. We find a steadily rising rate of liquor profit. In 1943 in Saskatchewan it was \$3 million; in 1951 it was up to \$9 million; and in the same year in Manitoba \$12 million, and in British Columbia \$19 million. Last year our liquor profits were in excess of \$10 million. Now, liquor profits loom large in provincial revenue, but in determining profits it is

important to look at both sides of the ledger and there are definitely two sides of the ledger here.

First, take the problems of drinking and driving. It is very difficult to get accurate statistics on the number or percentage of accidents that are caused by drinking and drunken driving, for two reasons. In the first place, in order to get statistics you have got to get proof and as you all know, many times it is overnight, it is hours from the time an accident occurs until the police get there, and unless a man is willing to admit he has been drinking, it is very difficult to get proof, and, therefore, the figures just don't reveal the facts. However, I do have some very interesting figures on this matter. I have a report from the Manitoba Traffic Division which states that, in 1951, one out of five accidents were directly attributable to liquor. I found a United States survey that says that in 1951, 31 per cent of the accidents were due to liquor. Some States put it as high as 40 per cent and some as high as 60 per cent; and they do have much more scientific tests in the United States than we have here.

When I was looking through these statistics, I came across the case of a traffic policeman who found a man driving full speed right down the middle of the sidewalk. He caught up to him as fast as he could and said, "What on earth are you doing driving right down the middle of the sidewalk?" And the man said, "Well, you see, officer, I just couldn't help it; I was too drunk to drive on the road." At least he knew he was too drunk to drive on the road; but all drivers do not do that.

Our statistics for Saskatchewan are somewhat less, but as I stated before, I do not think that they show the true picture, and I do think it would be fair to take 29 per cent, which is lower than most surveys, as the number of accidents in which liquor played a part.

So then we will turn first to property damage. In 1953 property damages was around \$4 million. Now, assuming liquor was the cause of one-fifth of these accidents, we have \$800,000 here on the debit side. We must add to this the amount paid by Government Insurance in benefits to those who received bodily injuries, in death benefits, in recompense for loss of pay; and then we have got to add to that the cost to the province in hospital bills where accidents were caused by liquor, because this is all part of the bill. We must add to this the cost of accidents, other than highway accidents, due to liquor; costs paid out by the Workmen's Compensation Board, man-hours lost from work, and this is no small amount. I have not got Canadian figures, but the Bureau of Alcoholism in the United States says that liquor and alcoholism cost the United States \$1 billion a year.

Then we turn to the cost of excessive drinking in the matter of crime. First, convictions for drunkenness. In 1934, the convictions for drunkenness were 19,800 men and 960 women; but in 1950, 71,000 men and 5,100 women. I also came across a survey on crime, not by any temperance organization, but by Edgar Hoover, the Director of the F.B.I. He says that in the United States crime cost the people \$50 billion a year. One survey rated liquor partially responsible for 31 per cent of the crime and completely responsible for 16 per cent. Another survey placed the responsibility at 23 per cent. But I am going to take a reasonable 29 per cent, or one to five, so that in the United States the cost of crime due

to liquor is approximately \$3 billion, or about \$80 to \$100 a family directly attributable to liquor. Now, if the cost in Canada is anywhere near what it is in the United States you get an idea of the cost in crime alone, and when we add the even more important things that cannot be measured in dollars and cents – the cost in human lives, in broken bones, in neglected children and resulting juvenile delinquency – and the cost to little children who lost a mother or a father, or both, in accidents due to liquor – can we honestly say, Mr. Speaker, that there is such a thing as liquor profit?

Having looked at statistics, the reason for public alarm becomes very apparent, and if parents could really know that the chances of one or more of their children becoming an alcoholic are twice as great as the combined chances of them developing tuberculosis or polio, they would get even more alarmed. But while we are alarmed, I think we are all at a loss to know just what is the right way to deal with this situation. We in Saskatchewan have comparatively restrictive laws. Should we relax our laws and increase the outlet and throw the sale of liquor wide open? I know there are a great many people who sincerely support this point of view. They say that because you forbid people to do a certain thing it makes them want to do it, and forbidden fruits are the sweetest. Well, personally, that is not my point of view. I think you could say the same for all laws. It would seem as reasonable to me to say that if you did not have laws against speeding, no one would want to speed. Or, because I am told by the health officers that I have to put my garbage in a garbage can, a covered can, I'm going to go and throw it out in the lane. However, this is just a personal opinion and it isn't personal opinion we want – it is facts. So let us try to look for a minute at some facts.

Does easy accessibility decrease drunkenness and lessen alcoholism? That is what we are trying to do. Well, France is a good example of a country in which they have practically no restrictive laws. For generations they have not had – it has been part of their way of life. In fact, I think I read recently where in one hotel they have installed a tap and all you have to do is have a drink of liquor if you prefer it instead of a drink of water. So there are no restrictions in France. And what is the situation in France? Well, I have here a report from Dr. Jelnick of Yale University, and he is probably the greatest authority on this subject on this continent. He states – and I wish you would pay attention to these figures as they are important – that France has one million full-blown alcoholics. Then I also have a report from a Minneapolis paper from a Dr. Quisling, a very famous French psychiatrist – and these are his statements, not mine: 60 per cent of the inmates of the mental hospitals in France are there because of alcohol. The French spend \$1 3/4 billion a year on drink. There is a steadily rising rate of alcoholism. The nation spends twice the taxes from alcoholic beverages on keeping up its mental hospitals.

Then when I turn to consumption figures per capita, I have them listed over an average of 21 years, and I find France is at the top of the list with 31 litres. In the United States where they have less restrictive laws than we have, I have here a 1950 report from the 'New York Times' in which it states that there are 700,000 chronic alcoholics in the United States, seven-eighths of them male, which is one of 12 in the population. Those are alarming figures. In fact, Mr. Speaker, they are so alarming that I can scarcely believe them to be true. I am only quoting the report

as I read it, but nevertheless it is a sign that all is not well in the State of New York.

Now then, we come to Canada. You know that Ontario has its cocktail bars and you can buy your liquor in restaurants; but in a recent survey I find that Ontario has the highest per capita consumption of absolute alcohol in Canada.

In the light of facts and figures like this, would it appear that easy accessibility is the answer? Would it help the situation, or would it make it worse? Of course, I cannot say definitively, because there are so many things involved in this business of the excessive use of alcohol. But, this much I would say, that until it can be proved by facts rather than by wishful thinking that more liberal liquor laws would help the situation, then I think we should be most awfully cautious in doing any liberalizing of our liquor laws.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this problem can never be solved by legislation alone; it is not as easy as that. Whether the legislation is liberal, or whether it is restrictive, it will not solve the question. The long-term policy must be one of education and a constant endeavour to remove those things in some societies which make men and women turn to excessive drinking, such as overcrowded, unhealthy slum-housing conditions; fears and tensions created by war; the moving together, crowding up into larger and larger cities – many things that cause this. This is not a new approach. We have been saying that for a long time that education is the answer. But, having said that, we have been content to fold our hands and say, ‘Now that this problem is settled, we can go on to the next.’ The truth is that the education is simply not being done and we have plenty of evidence of that; and that is why I welcome two recent steps taken by this Government in the hope of remedying the situation.

First, you all received a manual that is going to go into our schools, a manual on alcoholic studies. I hope you will look at it. This should be very valuable. It should be particularly valuable as a manual for teachers and as a guide as to how this study is presented. But, the value of this book will depend entirely on how it is used. I can imagine even a good book like this being placed in the schools and nothing very much happening. But, the material that is in that book can well be correlated into classes of health education, in science classes, in home economics classes; it should be excellent material for guidance classes, for classes in family life; and it would even be excellent material for mathematics classes to work out the cost of excessive drinking in this country. I would like to see a good deal of time spent in our teachers’ colleges and in our College of Education on how to present this problem in an intelligent manner in the schools. Superintendents of schools, during teachers’ institutes, could be very helpful in showing how to get the best use out of this book, and if there is a serious attempt made to use this book, and to do the educational job that we could do, it will have very far-reaching effects. We have seen the effect of an intelligent educational campaign on many health matters and we could, if we wanted to, do the same kind of job here. Of course, the schools cannot do it alone; we have got to have help from the homes and the church and the community. But, we should enlist the aid of the Health Education Branch of the Department of Public Health. We should be getting leadership from the Adult Education Division of the Department of Education. The Highway Traffic Board could assist, and the Government Insurance Office could help.

I was very pleased to see that an advisory committee is to be set up in this province very shortly. They are going to study this matter and make recommendations to the Government. This Bureau on Alcoholism could act as co-ordinator between the work in the schools and the work of this Committee. We in the C.C.F. Government are very proud of our many 'firsts', and I think justly proud of our many firsts when it comes to matters which affect human welfare, and it is my earnest hope that we may achieve another first on this really very important matter. Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Mr. John Wellbelove (Kerrovert-Kindersley): - Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in support of the motion, I would first like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. They made a pretty good job of it. Their style of presentation was in marked contrast, but they were equally sincere regarding the objectives of their Party.

The two new members representing Souris-Estevan and Rosthern respectively are to be congratulated on their 'maiden' speeches in this Legislative Assembly, and while we welcome them to this Assembly I think we regret the events that made it necessary for them to be here, especially in the loss of the member for Souris-Estevan, Mr. Ed. McCormack, a young man of great promise who would undoubtedly have made his mark in the political life of this province. With regard to the previous Leader of the Opposition, now a private member in the Federal House, I think we all agree that he was a disappointed and a disillusioned man after assuming the leadership of the Liberal Party in this province. You just do not walk into the premiership of a province; you have to consult the people. He did that on two occasions with not very satisfactory results and I think we on this side of the House can say in all sincerity that we were sorry to see him go. I think he was one of the greatest assets the C.C.F. Party had in the province of Saskatchewan while he retained the leadership of the Liberal Party, and we were sorry to see him go.

On November 7th we saw the headlines in the Saskatoon paper, "Asmunder A. Loftson named Liberal House Leader." I would like to congratulate him on that appointment. It takes courage to assume the leadership of the remnant of a Party that at one time held considerable influence in this province; but his approach to the task differs somewhat from that of his predecessor. I noticed in the Saskatoon 'Star-Phoenix' of November 3, 1951, a report is carried of Mr. Tucker addressing the Liberal Executive in the Bessborough hotel, and it said:

"The C.C.F. Government in Saskatchewan would suffer a smashing defeat in the next election if the anti-Socialist vote were not divided. We cannot defeat the C.C.F. any more than Churchill could have beaten labour with a united opposition vote."

Then, the present leader of the Liberal Party is reported in an interview as saying his party "would make no overtures to the Tories and would accept none" – a sort of no-truck-and-trade-with-the-enemy attitude. And I notice that Mr. Speaker has arranged an aisle space between the seat of the member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly) and those of the official Opposition in this House. The member for Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) who came into this House in 1948 did not take that precaution and at the present time he sits as a

Liberal – possibly by conviction, but I think by absorption; so I would warn the member for Souris-Estevan to keep that aisle clear and not bring his desk too close.

The Saskatoon ‘Star-Phoenix’ says that Mr. Loptson’s appointment as House Leader “is clearly an interim one.” I don’t know where they got that information. They say, “while the party continues its search for a permanent head.” Well, I do not know what affect that will have on the party – I hope none too great; but Anne Boleyn got into that same kind of fix at one time and it kind of upset her future anyway. However, we wish him well in his responsible position as Leader of Her Majesty’s most Loyal Opposition, and, Mr. Speaker, we can say that with all sincerity.

In the ‘Leader-Post’ on February 18, it says: “The Liberal Party must rebuild. Grass-roots organization needed.” We can all agree with that; but I thought that, if they can get those grass roots to sprout and show some sign of life and cover up the mud in their political backyard, which as been all too ready to hand for the past number of years, it will be to the credit of both the Liberal Party and to the conduct of the business of this House.

To anyone who is interested and has the welfare of the province at heart, there were several citations in the Speech from the Throne showing the progress that this province is making. In 1953, nearly 700 wells were drilled for oil or gas of which 300 will likely prove capable of commercial production. Prospecting and development in the pre-Cambrian Shield area surpassed expectations – 18,000 mineral claims recorded in 1953. New discoveries in base metal in the area adjacent to Flin Flon on ground mapped by provincial geological survey party two years ago insures the establishment of two more mines; another major mine in the Uranium City area, and smaller mines will produce when the El Dorado Mining Company mill at Beaver Lodge is capable of processing. All of this shows great progress and the prospectors’ assistance plan and the radio service have to a great extent contributed to this expansion.

I think it should be mentioned, too, although it was not referred to in the Speech from the Throne, that for the past six or seven years, at Vera, there has been a salt mine in production – a salt mine and mill, which, last year, processed 30,256 tons of salt. It is awfully good to see the name of Saskatchewan stamped on the bags of the Purity Salt. Also, there is a very active work south of Unity in sinking a shaft for the mining of potash. All of these discoveries and developments took place under a C.C.F. government and most of them during the past four or five years. But in all fairness to the previous government we have to say that they did initiate some steps towards discovery and development in addition to their well-known forestry plan of cut-out-and-get-out.

I noticed in the paper, just after the Liberal meeting here this week, where it says: “Saskatchewan has, to some extent, missed the boat by its slowness to develop the riches of the north land.” I think Dr. Russel Partridge, Prince Albert, president of the Saskatchewan Liberal Association, made that statement. It is always interesting to hear our Liberal friends talk about the development of the natural resources of Saskatchewan – what they would have done if they had been sitting on this side of the House. They forget that they sat around here for about 30 years and did very little, and they are like the dog with the tin can on its tail: they have a record it is pretty hard to get away from. It is a very embarrassing thing, sometimes, to have a record.

The Liberal Party up until 1944 was of the opinion that they owned the province, and I think some of the Liberals really think they do at the present time. They have not yet awakened to the fact that the people of Saskatchewan own the province, and that for the past decade they have trusted the administration of this province to a C.C.F. government. Some of our Liberal friends have not awakened to that yet. Mr. Speaker, we have a province here to be proud of and I trust that among the achievements of the 'Jubilee' year not only will we be able to refresh our memories of our brief historic past, but that our people, especially our young people, will have an opportunity of getting a view into the possibilities of the future of this great province, a province which they will inherit.

In 1939, the Liberal government passed an Act to establish the Industrial Development Board. Among other things, its duties were: (a) Investigation of Saskatchewan resources in minerals, fur, game, fish, water powers and forests; (b) the promotion of the utilization of the natural resources of Saskatchewan; (c) development of the products of the Saskatchewan industries and industrial development of Saskatchewan; (d) the study of industrial possibilities of all classes of organic materials and natural resources (that is a big order); (e) the undertaking of research with respect to farm products and resources for use in industry. Now those are only five of the 14 items on which this Industrial Development Board was to conduct inquiries and report annually to the Minister of Natural Resources. I want to say that whoever was responsible for the passing of that legislation must have caught a glimpse of the possibilities of the future and they are to be commended for their wide grasp of those possibilities; but it was too much for the government of the day. We find them reverting to that old familiar 'do nothing' attitude so characteristic of them during their last years of office especially; and so, in 1943, they abolished this Industrial Development Board and constituted the Saskatchewan Reconstruction Council. Now the definition of the duties of that Council are beautiful in their vagueness. This is it:

"They shall study and investigate conditions and problems that are likely to arise during and after the war."

So, after four uneventful and lingering years this Industrial Development Board (a board which could have done a tremendous lot and had great possibilities) came to an end and the Saskatchewan Reconstruction Council took over. It must have been that the government of the day thought that further investigation of the province's resources was not needed, that the promotion of utilization of natural resources was completed, and that a study of industrial possibilities was satisfactorily concluded.

They talk about us missing the boat! They had a good boat built and then scuttled it; so there is very little room for them to talk about this Government missing the boat, and it was small wonder, then, that the resources of forest reserves were rapidly depleted and the vast mining reserves and resources were unexplored and undeveloped.

There were only 143 oil wells drilled in 43 years during previous government administration, and only a trace of oil found. During the greater portion of that period intensive development and exploration work was going on just across the border in our neighbouring province of Alberta. How different it is today! Every week now we see reports in our daily papers of wells drilled, the number abandoned and the number proved up as producers. We read

the banner-line in the 'Star-Phoenix' of September 16:

"Saskatchewan oil resources start paying off. The province net \$2,531,999 on the sale of leases on Crown lands near Fosterton."

Now that is giving the Opposition an awful lot of concern. They have never seemed to grasp that this Government is capable of formulating a policy under the C.C.F. co-operative administration which will meet the needs of this province. I remember I spoke in the House here, in 1945, and the Leader of the Opposition then, who now holds the responsible position of a representative of Her Majesty, said: "Despite what the member for Kerrobert-Kindersley may think, that is not the policy of the Government which he supports." I said that we were quite capable as a people of hammering out a policy which would meet the needs of the people of our province under the banner of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation; that we would have a place there for co-operative development, for private enterprise, and for public development under the auspices of the Government. He challenged my statement; but today we have that in its fulfillment and it is one of the greatest thorns in the side of members of the Opposition. The trouble is they mapped the programme they thought we should follow. If they had spent more time on mapping one for themselves they might have had a policy to go to the people with at this time. But as you look back over the years most of us can remember when speaker after speaker on the Opposition side if the House got up and yelled "expropriation and confiscation" on purpose to get those headlines into the press at a time when this Government and this province needed risk and development capital coming into the province. Undoubtedly it had some effect. It kept some out; but a lot came in, and I think the Liberal opposition provided ample evidence to substantiate the statement made by the Premier on the floor of this House, that the Liberal Party would prefer to wreck the economy of this province rather than see prosperity under a C.C.F. government. It is as true today as it ever was.

When this Government came into office the Imperial Oil held rights to about 20 million acres without any very definite commitment as to the work to be performed. They left this province when this Government came into power, and what glee there was in the Opposition ranks and the Liberal press! They said, "As soon as you fellows came in, out they go; they will have nothing to do with you." But, today, we find them back, and with reference to the Smiley oilfield which is in my constituency, we find an article in the Saskatoon paper which says:

"The Imperial Oil have struck light crude of approximately 36 degrees gravity comparable to Redwater, Alberta, crude. Imperial are drilling two wells weekly. Imperial have spent nearly \$11 million on exploration and development in the past two years."

That was the Company which some of the members who are sitting there today will remember that they said, "You will never seem them come back into Saskatchewan as long as there is a C.C.F. government in power."

Only this week, on February 16, there was notification in connection with that same light oil discovery at Smiley: "Imperial Oil has abandoned an extension driller in the Smiley light oil field, 18 miles northwest of Kindersley; Imperial at Dewar Lake (that would be away west of the field that is

being proved up at the present time – west and possibly a little north). It goes on to state:

“To date there have been 56 wells drilled in the field, accounting for 50 wells capable of light oil production, four of gas production and two abandoned.”

Imperial Oil are drilling in there; Canada Southern and also the Hudson Bay Oil and Gas Limited.

When you go a little further west to Coleville there is the heavy oil field production there, as was stated in the House here. Last spring there was a 5,000 barrel topping plant opened at Coleville by the Refinery Operators Limited of Calgary which has since changed hands, and there are large gas reserves in that Coleville field. The House might be interested to hear this little quotation from C. U. Daniels, the president of the Royalite Oil Company Limited, who announced production of the millionth barrel of oil from the Coleville heavy gravity oil field jointly operated by Royalite and the Canadian Southern Oil – the milestone of the million barrels was passed on December 24.

Gas reserves have also been located at Glidden and Marengo and at several other locations within the general areas drilling for gas and oil. Promising discoveries of both gas and oil have been made and the reserves, as you know, of the Brock field are at present serving Saskatoon.

It is interesting to note that during the 1952 election campaign, when the Liberals were straining the credulity of the people by telling them there was no development in the province under a C.C.F. government and that everything was stagnating, they never resorted to that line of fabrication when they came into the Kerrobert-Kindersley constituency. Instead of that they sent in the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron) to trot out his old ‘Rubbra’ story – I think most members have heard that repeated several times. Well, he came in there and wasn’t able to spend very much time. I wish he was here, this afternoon, because I would like personally to congratulate him – wherever he spoke my majority trebled; that was the reaction of the people to the Rubbra story as far as that district is concerned.

The development of gas and oil reserves in this area has brought in quite a large influx of population. It is a little difficult to determine just at the present time what population will be permanently resident there. Development crews will be moving on, and there will be crews coming into service the wells; but in the meantime problems are arising. One problem is in connection with the municipal roads there resulting from the heavy traffic of development material and the piping coming in over those municipal roads which are not built to stand that traffic. It is going to be a heavy drain for a while on the municipalities. Eventually, of course, as the fields are drilled out and the wells are brought into production the municipalities will have a new source of revenue; but in the interim there is a heavy burden to carry, and I think some representations may be made to the Government in that regard.

Then there is the school accommodation which poses another problem at Kindersley, Smiley and Coleville. On June 127, there was a new \$170,000 school opened in Kindersley containing an additional 12 classrooms; that adds up now to 25 classrooms, and economics lab, workshop, commercial room all

operating under the larger school unit. I want to tell the Minister of Education that larger school unit is a blessing to the youngsters in rural areas where they can get all the advantages of a technical school as well as their usual high school training in close proximity to their homes. But the unit is being put to considerable expense. We have two or three trailer towns there, and a lot of married people with young families, and Kindersley school is being taxed to full capacity now even in spite of the building of that new school. Coleville is in the same position. They have been put to considerable expense there to provide accommodation. Smiley is now face to face with exactly the same problems, and I expect some assistance will be sought from the Department of Education to cope with that situation which may be partly a transient situation but a lot of it, we hope, will be permanent.

There is one thing I want to deal with which has been giving quite a bit of concern and that is the increase in the size of our farm holdings and the decrease in our rural population. I noticed that, in a recent address to the Moose Jaw Chamber of Commerce, Professor Baker is reported in the daily press to have touched on this disturbing problem. He notes that the trend is not new; from the peak of 152,000 people in the rural areas in 1936, it dropped to 112,000 in 1951, and he says it may be nearer 100,000 today. I used to be interested in this problem some years ago, and I have not got the last census returns; but when the 1941 census returns were taken there were, in Saskatchewan, 3,811 farms of over two sections and, included in that number were 277 farms of over 5,000 acres which, of course, would include the ranches.

Now, to attract our young couples back to the farm and keep them there is one of the greatest problems I think that faces us today. Urban life is all right, but I think the strength of our province was built on these rural communities, and to see the depopulation of our rural areas at the present time is something which is giving a good many people quite a lot of concern. Of course the size of farm holdings with the modern equipment is one of the main contributing factors, but it would seem that if an individual, or a company of grain farmers, intends to farm more land than is necessary as an economic unit to maintain a decent living standard, then some deterrent will have to be invoked to prevent the unnecessary accumulation of land holdings.

The congestion of our wheat marketing channels is causing hardship to the farmers with small holdings. If the quota of wheat that Canada can place in domestic and export channels is to be in any way curtailed, I think we will have to look a little nearer home for a part at least of the solution. The trade channels are built up by the Department of Trade and Commerce and the overseas commissioners, and they are the right of everybody that markets or grows an exportable commodity – they are not the monopoly of a few. Canadian farmers, if my figures are right, have harvested a total of 1,855,000,000 of wheat in the past three years, an average of 618,000,000 bushels a year; that is nearly twice the pre-war (1935-39) average on almost the identical acreage, according to the 'Wheat Review'. Canada's quota of wheat deliveries is the signatories under the International Wheat Agreement is only 163 million bushels of wheat.

There was a disturbing headline in last night's paper which said: "Today No. 1 Northern lakehead price is \$1.79." That is a drop of 24 cents in a little over six months from the time the crop year opened on August 1. The lakehead price then was \$2.03; but one of the disturbing things is that there are ten countries who are signatories of the International Wheat Agreement who have not taken any wheat during this crop year, and under the terms

of the agreement they are not obligated to take it until we get down to the floor price of \$1.50, or at the lowest quoted price during the crop year, if they buy then. Collectively they have contracted for 80 million bushels of wheat. There is also another disturbing factor and that is that the United States has boosted its export subsidy to equal the drop in Canadian prices, and Canadian prices as at December 15 were none too reassuring to some countries under the International Wheat Agreement. I note that Spain is under contract for something over 90 million bushels; she has taken none from Canada and has taken nearly 8 million from the United States. Japan is under contract for 36 3/4 million bushels, and she has taken 4 1/2 million from Canada and 18 1/2 million from the United States. Ceylon is under contract for 10 1/4 million bushels, and she has taken none from Canada but has taken 6 3/4 million bushels from Australia. The paper stated, last night, that Canada and the United States are fighting sharply for overseas markets and Canadian officials are in constant consultation, realizing what drastic under-cutting might do to the price in general.

There are some things not very clear in that statement. Just what the difference in this price will mean to the producer is not too clear. Mr. Argue asked, in the House: "Will not this mean a reduction in the return to the producer?" Mr. Howe replied, "There is no grain going through Port Arthur and Fort William; you cannot decrease nothing by nothing." Later Mr. Drew inquired: "Would it have the effect of bringing about a different price to the producer in the eastern part of the western provinces compared to the producer in the western part of the western provinces?" Mr. Howe's reply was "No."

It leads us to believe that this cut will not make any difference in the price of our wheat, but in today's paper you will notice that there are seven cargoes afloat out of Vancouver brought by British shippers under the forwarding agreement by the Wheat Board, and they are looking for an adjustment of \$176,400 on those seven cargoes. Well if they get an adjustment there under the forwarding shipping agreement that they have, there is absolutely no doubt that it is going to have an effect on the price of the wheat. True, wheat was moving into consumptive channels at reasonable rates for the first three months of the crop year – 69.9 million bushels as compared with 80.2 a year ago, but that is very little consolation to the farmer who has to meet store bills and cannot market his wheat.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that by introducing (or re-introducing) the individual quota system, excessive deliveries for large holdings would be held in abeyance, marketing facilities could still be utilized to the full, and no one would be unduly penalized, and the small holder, who after all comprises more than half of our farming population, would have a fair chance to market sufficient grain to meet his immediate needs and when the marketing channels cleared additional individual quotas could be allotted. The Government does recognize this to some extent under the present marketing agreement, because it was three bushels per acre or 500 bushels to the unit, whichever was the greater. But the best insurance (as we have always preached) a farmer can have against crop failure is to carry a full granary from the good years as an insurance against the short crop years. I don't think that has altered at all. On several occasions the Wheat Pool delegates have asked for introduction by the Federal Government of the system of the ever-normal granary whereby advances would be made to farmers on grain stored in the granaries so that they could have sufficient cash on hand to meet their immediate financial requirements. The Federal Government has not seen fit to accede to

that request yet, but I think a case could be made where they are prepared to pay the elevator companies off-track storage, you find them leasing large buildings and storing grain; well, somebody has to pay for the trucking back of that grain as well as the storage of it at the present time.

The United States decided to cut its wheat acreage for 1954 by 16 million acres. It is rather interesting to see Mr. Gardiner's comment on that in the Throne Speech debate at Ottawa. He says that is possibly the greatest assistance ever given to Canadian wheat growers. I notice that Mr. Gardiner (I think quite properly) does not recommend that policy to the farmers of Canada. The Federal and Provincial conference at Ottawa, this year, came up with very few answers to the farmers' problems. The 'Western Producer' said:

"Canadian agricultural policy should be directed to finding markets for what farmers produced rather than plans for cutting grain production just because there is a grain surplus this year."

That was the consensus of opinion voiced emphatically at Ottawa. Federal Minister J. G. Gardiner and the Provincial Minister supported that view. I think they are quite right in doing that. Mr. Gardiner was quoted as saying: "Go out and produce what you are best able to produce; the biggest market for most of your farm products is in Canada." Mr. Gardiner remarked:

"There have been a lot of comments on my earlier suggestion that some of the surplus grain be used to feed hogs. If the farmer can produce hogs, his first duty would be to raise hogs before running to the government seeking assistance."

There is a stroke of genius running through that advice from high-level quarters. There is no need to worry about your grain out in the piles exposed to the weather – go into hog production, they increase more rapidly than most other livestock; but the \$64 question is left, as usual, to the farmer – if he raises hogs, what is he going to do about marketing them? The Federal Minister of Agriculture has not supplied an answer to that one yet. He did not in the past, and I do not suppose he will again; but it is interesting to note that Dr. Darke, the agricultural adviser to United Kingdom High Commissioner, said in Ottawa:

"Do not write off the British market. Britain only produces thirty per cent of her grain needs, 13 per cent of her oils and fats, 52 per cent of her carcass meats and 45 per cent of her bacon. Her needs have to be met from outside."

Experts are all agreed that the world is not producing more foodstuffs than the people of the world need to meet their requirements; but one of the greatest problems facing us, today, is to get those artificial surpluses distributed to the people who are in dire need and to get sufficient returns back to the producer to pay for his production costs.

Canadian wheat growers were naturally much concerned regarding that statement by the government of the United States that they were prepared to subsidize wheat outside of the International agreement. They were prepared to subsidize it up to 50 cents, and I suppose they are adding a little more to their subsidy at the present time. The Commodity Credit Corporation has 450 million bushels of wheat and they have another 300 million bushels of wheat on which they made advances by way of loans to farmers of the United States. If they were to throw that on the market, it would be quite a menace to the other wheat-producing countries; but there is one thing about it – they do reserve the right to determine what quantities, quality, classes and grades they will offer for consideration under the subsidy. As is generally known, here in western Canada we grow very high protein wheat and if it is low-grade wheat or low protein content they offer, it would not be a very great competitor on the British market, but it will be on some of the other world markets.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think the Canadian Government is to be commended for sending that three-man delegation out into the East to see what they can do with regard to opening up new markets for our wheat in the East. I was much interested in Dr. Harrington's statement when he came back from India after being loaned to the India government in connection with their rice-breeding campaign. I was interested to hear him say that rice forms the staple food of more people than does wheat. Of course, quite a few of those tropical regions take less food than we do, and I was interested when, through the courtesy of members of the Legislature, we were enabled to visit Ceylon a couple of years ago, where the great Gal'ola dam project is under construction, under the Colombo plan. They have what they call a 'Shifting agriculture' there for some portions of their farmers, different from our dust-bowl shifting agriculture. There, for generations, that section of their people have just burned off a little patch on the edge of the jungle and worked it up by hand, seeded enough of the upland rice and other grains to meet their immediate needs, supplementing it with wild fruits and nuts and other things which they can find in the jungle. Then, when the growth becomes too thick and too persistent, they just burn off another piece and move along. That is what they have been doing year after year.

When talking to the superintendent of the experimental farm, he said: "We hope to anchor these people and then, in another couple of generations, we will have good farmers on the island of Ceylon. We will be allocating to them upland land and irrigated land." I asked him what acreage would be allocated to them, and he said, "They will get two acres of irrigated land and three acres of upland land and maintain a family." What a difference to what we have in this country! – but, of course, there they have all-the-year-round production. There is no such thing as winter there, and it makes quite a difference.

I want just briefly to refer to the matter that the previous speaker has gone into quite exhaustively. I want to commend the Government for setting up the Bureau of Alcoholism for the treatment and the cure of people who are addicted to alcoholic beverages. I think it is generally agreed you can never legislate people into temperate beings. I think Alcoholics Anonymous are doing a marvelous work, and should be commended for it. They have an approach which, of course, is their own. They can approach an addict because they have been through it, and they can tell him the evils of it and the possibilities of overcoming it; but it is not so much the addicts we should be concerned with, I think it is the younger generation. You hear so many people say they would

not object to their children going out to a school dance if it was not for the cursed liquor that people bring in there. It is getting into our community life from all angles, and you hear men say sometimes, “ I can take a glass of beer or a glass of liquor and it doesn’t do me any harm.”

Well, I want to be fair to the liquor trade – it may not do that man any harm, but it is not fair to judge the liquor traffic by those individuals any more than it would be fair to judge an artists by an uncompleted canvas. Until the picture is completed you cannot judge the ability or the possibilities of that artist, and you can only properly judge the liquor traffic by its finished product: the people who are slain on our highways, the wrecked homes, the young people who come from homes to be taken into our institutions who never had a chance because of the curse of liquor in their homes; and prostitution and the brothel which are the hand-maids of the liquor traffic. I think that really we should go right ahead with this programme, bring it to the notice and attention of our young people, because it is the young people we have to deal with. I do hope, Mr. Provincial Treasurer, that in a few years we find temperance making such great inroads into our provincial revenue from liquor profits that we will realize we have a shrinkage there; but just as soon as people give up spending and wasting their money on alcoholic beverages and put it into consumer goods, we will be better off and they will be better off, too.

There is another thing I want to deal with briefly. The labour members are much concerned about Bill No. 7, and Act respecting Criminal Law, in connection with the Federal House. Well, I am not going to trespass on their premises at all; but another phase of that Act I want o deal with is Federal legislation, something I think we should be most earnestly concerned about. That Act deals with, in Part 5, Section 177, “sweepstakes.” Section 179 deals with lotteries, and there is an agitation in some quarters to water down the restrictions on sweepstakes and lotteries, or to abolish the restrictions altogether and use sweepstakes and lotteries as a method of raising public funds. Now gambling, I think, is one of the most sinister and degrading influences in the public and private life of our country, once you let it get away

...

Mr. Gibbs: - I don’t agree.

Mr. Wellbelove: - There are always those, Mr. Speaker, who see in the gambling enterprise an easy way of making money by exploiting a gullible public, and Canada is no exception. Gambling is one of the most ancient social problems that the world has had to deal with. I am told that the old Sanskrit literature abounds in allusion to this evil, and Biblical references you find galore. Only just a few weeks ago we had that picture ‘The Robe’ showing in our local theatres, where it portrayed the soldiers at the foot of the Cross, “and for his raiment they did cast lots.” So gambling is nothing new. The appeal to chance and luck and fortune is akin to the materialistic conception of life in which Fate is accepted as a determining factor in life, and it is alien to a Christian philosophy of life altogether. It would seem that every civilized nation, at some time in its history, has had to subject gambling to definite legislative restraint. The Unlawful Games Act was passed in Britain in 1541; in 1600, gambling appears to have become a monopoly of the King, who licensed it. There were lotteries in aid of the English plantations in Virginia in 1612; and a lottery to finance repairs of damage done by the Spaniards to the fishing fleet in 1640. By the end of the century the control passed again into the hands of Parliament, and in 1698 an Act declared that all lotteries were a common and a public nuisance.

Now, in 1930, the Irish Free State authorized the promotion of state lotteries by the inauguration of the Public Charitable Hospital statute. The first sweepstake promoted was held on the Manchester November Handicap in 1930, and from the November 30th race, to the Caesarewitch race October, 1937, tickets were sold which brought in, on commissions and sale of tickets, 71 million pounds sterling; expenses were 18 million pounds; prizes and staff duties, 41 million pounds (I am not dealing with odd numbers); the hospitals got 11 million pounds. Sixty million pounds of the 71 million never found its way into the hospitals for which it was supposed to have been instituted.

It was often said it will benefit the hospitals. Sweepstakes are not favoured by the hospitals. The Canadian Hospital Council, which represents all of the 13 hospital associations in Canada, has gone strongly on record as being opposed to the principle of financing hospitals by the sweepstake method. The British Hospital Association, despite the heavy sale of the Irish tickets in Great Britain, passed a resolution that the British Hospital Association is not in favour of amending the law affecting public sweepstakes which purports to be for the benefit of voluntary hospital.

Then you may recall that, in 1950, the mayor of the city of New York was favourable to the request for the State of New York to legalize betting on public sport events. Many of you may have on file the presentation that Governor Dewey made to the State Legislature. Among other points I think he made a fine showing. He said, "First, it is fundamentally immoral to encourage the belief by a people as a whole in gambling as a source of family income; second, it would be an indecent thing to finance so largely out of the weaknesses of the people; third, if the state puts approval on the morals and decency of wholesale betting there is no logical place at which the line can be drawn (that is worth remembering); fourth, every proposal for legalized gambling would provide a continuous invitation under the sponsorship of the state for husbands and wives to gamble away the money needed for the support of the family; fifth, gambling on professional sport has been the most immoralizing and destructive influence on American sports."

There is today, as there always has been, an unequitable distribution of wealth, an accumulation of excessive wealth on one side and poverty on the other. Surely nobody would say that to introduce gambling would level or even that up at all. And we had the Royal Commission on state lotteries reporting in Great Britain in 1933, and they had this to say: "It may be the case that the propensity to wager is on the increase among the populace, but this is no reason why the government should officially encourage gambling."

Mr. Speaker, the statement of the Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone, some years ago, was true then and it is true today: "The duty of a government is to make it easier for a man to go right and harder for a man to go wrong."

I will support the motion.

Mr. A. L. S. Brown (Bengough): - It is indeed with a great deal of hesitancy that I rise to take part in this debate, particularly on a Friday afternoon in which members have had a rather long and hard week, and also particularly following the two speakers who have just immediately preceded me. I can assure you that I will be unable to contribute to the House the charm, the personality and the beauty of the member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper), and I can assure you that I cannot hope to match the

sincerity, the wisdom and the experience which was contributed, this afternoon, by the member for Kerrobert-Kindersley.

I rise to take part in this debate primarily because of certain remarks which were made by members of the Opposition, remarks which I felt I could not let go unchallenged and to some extent, in my opinion at least, correct the impression which may have been left among the members and which may have been left among the people of the province. However, before I touch on that, Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with those who have preceded me in congratulating the mover and the seconder on their contributions to this debate, not only on the basis of the contribution each made in this House, but also on the fact that they presented to this House, by virtue of their occupations, one a labourer and one a farmer, both of whom occupy themselves by working with their hands, the viewpoint in this House of people do work with their hands. I have often felt, Mr. Speaker, that in the parliaments of a land too often do we not have members who are directly representative of that class of people in our communities. I suggest that it is those classes of people who do, in the final analysis, make the greatest contribution to the increasing of the wealth of any nation. It is true that we require other occupations and other professions; but in the final analysis it is from the man who goes out among the raw materials of the world, whether it is on the farm, in the shop, in the factory, or providing some form of transportation service; or other services, that we do get this new wealth. I do feel that contributions which they make give credit to the occupations which they do represent.

I want also to associate myself in congratulating the new members to this House, and I was particularly interested yesterday in listening to the Liberal member for Souris-Estevan (Mr. Kohaly) as he made his 'maiden' speech in the House. I was rather interested in learning how it would be possible for an individual who had succeeded in getting both a Liberal nomination and a Tory nomination to contest an election – what kind of a contribution we could expect from him. I think that we will see followed the precedent which was followed by one who at one time entered the Chamber with somewhat of a Tory banner, and that he will end up very closely associated with the Liberal party. It might be presumptuous on my part to give some advice to the young lad from Souris-Estevan, but even with the fear of being presumptuous, I would like to suggest to him that you cannot wallow round in the mire surrounding any organization such as the Liberal party in its political activities has indicated it has done, without getting yourself involved. I think, Mr. Speaker, it was the Hon. Charles Dunning who once made the famous statement that if you want to clean up a pig-pen the only way to do so is to get right in. I would suggest to the member for Souris-Estevan that if he hoped to do that possibly, he had better get right in and indicate clearly once and for all, as has the member for Moosomin, where his loyalties are and will no doubt remain.

As has been mentioned in this House, Mr. Speaker, this is the tenth year of office of this C.C.F. – the tenth year of office of the first 'People's Government' on the North American continent. Possibly on our ten-year anniversary we should take a little look at our performances in the past with a view to projecting our future programme, so that it can be related back to our experience in the last ten years.

The C.C.F. Party was born out of the economic and social necessity of the people of western Canada. It was with that view in mind, to improve the economic and social conditions of the people of Saskatchewan, that we first

started to inaugurate and implement the C.C.F. programme back in 1944. We, at that time as today, held certain firm beliefs regarding economic theories as they affect our economy and our social life. I think that the experiences which we have had in the last ten years have proven the worth of those economic theories which we held at that time. It did indeed, back in 1944 and 1945, take courage and vision to undertake a socialistic enterprise such as establishing a Government Insurance; such as undertaking to set up the Power Corporation, or as it was known at that time, the Power Commission, which later became the Power Corporation, as a public utility for the distribution of our power throughout the entire province. It took courage and vision to undertake enterprises such as that. But the success of those socially-operated enterprises gives us the courage, or should give us the courage, and the vision to expand that economic theory which we have proved to be successful. It may be true, Mr. Speaker, that some of our experiences in socially-owned enterprises on publicly-owned level have not been as happy as we would like to have seen them. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that our experiences in those enterprises has even more convinced me that our economic theory of social ownership is right, and that ultimately that will be the dominating form of ownership we will have not only in Saskatchewan, not only in Canada, but throughout the entire world if we hope to bring economic security to ourselves and to the other people of the world.

We had a social theory as well, and many people join the Socialist movement as a protest against human suffering and human privation. Our experience in our short ten years in office has convinced us that we, by co-operative effort, can eliminate much of the human suffering and human privation which does exist not only in Saskatchewan but throughout the world. If we look forward to the future, I think our next ten years must be based upon the same economic belief that is in enterprises such as the Government Insurance, expansion of the Power Corporation and others along that same line that must be created and expanded. Our same social theory must be exactly the same as it was in 1944. We have not yet, even within the confines of this province, eliminated the human suffering that does exist, and we cannot rest content until we have expanded that theory so that as far as possible we have eliminated human suffering and human privation.

The member for Souris-Estevan suggested yesterday that the prosperity in Saskatchewan might be attributed mainly to the efforts of free enterprise in this province. I will agree with anyone who suggest that, in the last ten years, free private enterprise (or whichever term you may wish to apply to it) has made a contribution to the so-called prosperity and to the real development which has taken place in this province. But the fact that they have done so does not necessarily mean that we believe that that is the predominant type of enterprise which we should have in this province. If we had had a government at Ottawa, a government which does, by virtue of our constitution, control the finances of this province and which does control to a large extent, the economy of this province; if we had had a government in there with a philosophy which believed in social ownership, which would have been prepared to do as it did in respect to the establishing of the El Dorado mine in the uranium field, if they had been prepared to invest in Saskatchewan or in any other province which was prepared to have the investment made, we could have had even greater development than has been made possible through the investments of free enterprise in this province.

As the Premier pointed out here in his speech a few days ago, we here in Saskatchewan have taken part in the prosperity that has gone on

throughout Canada, a prosperity which was in the initial stage brought about through the preparation for war and war itself and the aftermath of war, and the preparation and actual participation in the war in Korea. It is true that we have. It is true that the agricultural industry has had some prosperity, but the prosperity that has existed in the agricultural industry is due largely to two things: first, as was pointed out here, the great increase in production that has taken place due to climatic conditions in respect to our grain crop, which is the largest agricultural crop which we have to grow; and secondly, that there has been maintained a fairly stable dollar-value for that agricultural product. It has not been due to the fact that we have had a universal security within that industry. It is not based upon a premise which will assure that even in the immediate future we shall have any continued security or stability within that industry.

We have had a somewhat stable price for agricultural products because it has been under agreement respecting exports, in the early stages with the Canadian-Anglo Wheat Agreement, and later with the International Wheat Agreement. But I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that we have had up until the moment, a market for our grain products; we had a market for cattle; we had at one time a market for hogs; we had at one time a market for poultry and dairy products. The Liberal Government at Ottawa through its fiscal policy has succeeded in losing every one of those markets. Giving them one or two more years on their present basis, if they have not already done so, they will have succeeded in losing the market for our wheat which is not the only market at the moment of which there is any assurance. Let us not kid ourselves into believing that these things cannot happen here. Even in Saskatchewan, if we get this great industrial development, if we get a great expansion of our oil development to the point where we have large oil fields in Saskatchewan, even larger than they have got them in the province of Alberta; if we reach the point where we have got an oil well on every quarter section, basically our welfare will still depend upon the price or the purchasing power of our agricultural products.

The State of Texas is a state often thought of as wealthy, a state which has in the past produced enormous quantities of wealth in the form not only of agricultural products, but in the form of oil and other minerals. That is the state, Mr. Speaker, to which the combines from Saskatchewan were going, not so long ago, to harvest the bountiful crops which they had in that state at that time. Yet, what do we find this past summer? In June of last year, we find beef being sold over the counter for as low as 7 1/2 cents a pound; short ribs of beef selling over the counter at 7 1/2 cents a pound. What was the explanation they gave for beef selling that low? It was the fact that the people of Texas were too 'broke' to pay any more than 7 1/2 cents a pound for meat. Translate that back into what the producer is getting and you have got us back to where we were in 1937 when the farmers of this province (including myself) sold beef on the hoof for as low as one cent a pound. Do not kid ourselves that it cannot happen here. We have got exactly the same economic conditions as they have in the State of Texas. Given the same physical conditions which existed in the State of Texas, we will have exactly the same condition existing here in which we will not be able to dispose at any price of those agricultural products we are still able to grow, which will be livestock and livestock products.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition made reference to the relationship of labour as it affects the implement industry and the price that we here in

the west pay for our agricultural implements. He suggested, or at least left the impression in my mind – and checking his speech, in Hansard, did not change the impression he made at that time – that he was trying to create the impression in the minds of members of this Assembly that the major cause of the high cost of farm implements was the fact that labour charges are a big item in the cost of implements, and it is a big cost in the manufacturing of anything else. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the investigation which we held here in the Spring of 1952 proved convincingly that the increased cost of labour is not the reason for the increased cost in farm implements to the farmer.

You can look at it in two ways, if you like, Mr. Speaker. The index price, from 1945 to 1950, of farm implements went up by 63 per cent. It went up from 100 (assuming 1945 as a basic year) up to 163 – the cost of farm implements. The cost of labour, (using the same basic year 1945) from 1945 to 1951 went up by 50 per cent, or went up to 150. In other words, the cost of labour did not go along with the rising cost of the implements to the farmer.

Or we could look at it in another light. In 1945, the amount of cost that could be attributed to wages in a farm implement, in the overall picture was 42.4 per cent. In 1950, the cost that could be attributed to wages was not 42 per cent, but rather 29.9. In other words, it had dropped by over 12 per cent. I don't think that you can attribute the increased cost of implements to labour alone, or say that labour was even a major factor in the increased costs.

These figures are taken from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and if I am wrong in my figures, there is only one reason why I am. The implement companies, as you well recall, refused to come before us and give us the factory cost which would have shown what was the major item which went into the cost of these farm implements used in Saskatchewan. But the information which the Committee was able to get, taken from the same source (the Dominion Bureau of Statistics) indicates that the amount of profit went up from 9.9 per cent in 1945 to 16.8 per cent in 1950. I think my hon. friends are prepared to admit that that is the major reason why the price of farm implements to the farmers went up.

Mr. Walker (Hanley): - They just don't want to believe it.

Mr. Brown: - He also made some reference to some investments which he had in the Cockshutt Farm Implement Company. From his remarks in Hansard I take it that he had some \$1,600 invested in shares in this particular company. He did not tell us just when he placed that investment in the Cockshutt Company, but he did suggest that he only got 6 per cent return on his investment at the best, when he was getting a return of \$1.00 per share on his investment. Well, if that is all they were returning to him I think he should see his lawyer and have some accountings made by the Cockshutt Farm Equipment to him, because I think, if that is what he received, then the Cockshutt Farm Company must be holding something back from him, for, in 1951, the return after taxes were paid on shares was \$6.20 per share – not \$1.00.

Mr. Loftson: - Oh, you have got that balled up, too.

Mr. Brown: - And then he was complaining that he did not think he was going to get 40 cents on his shares at the present time. Well, if he got

40 cents, he was gypping them in this case. He was only supposed to be entitled to 25 cents; but they are supposed to be paid four times and the shares were split in 1952, which gives him eight times the amount of return on his share investment. Then you would likely gather . . .

Mr. McDonald: - You had better take a lesson in accounting.

Mr. Lopton: - I would like to go to the school that you went to.

Mr. Brown: - He also suggested that possibly the implement companies were not making too much money and he quoted to us figures in which it was suggested the Cockshutt Farm Equipment Limited, from the latest financial report which he was able to get, only made \$1,100,000 profit on sales of some \$49,000,000. I was not able to see the last financial statement or any late financial statement of the Cockshutt Farm Equipment, but the 'Financial Post' service indicates that in 1952, this company to which he refers made sales of \$57 million and that it had a profit not of \$1,100,000, but rather of \$6,720,000. My hon. friend is just a little bit out in his figures; possibly not too serious. However, I don't think he should attempt to justify the 'short change' which he apparently received from the Cockshutt Farm Company on the basis that they did not make too much profit.

He also made reference to the fact that we here on this side of the House were possibly giving too much credit to men such as Mr. J. S. Woodsworth in their contribution to the social welfare, and improvements in that respect, here in Canada. He used as an illustration, the family allowance. He stated that the family allowance was brought in two years after Mr. Woodsworth died. It is true that it was brought in two years later, but in building a social economy, or any other type of economy, those people who pioneer often do not live to reap the benefits for themselves, or even to see the benefits passed on to other people or to the generations which follow. The reasons that we here on this side hold up the work which Mr. J. S. Woodsworth did, was not necessarily in regards to one or any particular social benefit for which he worked, but that he was a man who was not afraid to stand alone and be counted. He was not afraid to go out and pioneer for anything which he thought was for the betterment of humanity, and his life illustrates greatly that he was conducting a campaign against human suffering. It is because we had men such as that, that we have got these things enacted today. Not that they alone were responsible; but because they were able to influence public opinion and to influence legislatures which, in the final analysis, do bring about these things, to the point where they recognize the justice and the merits of the things which he had been advocating for many, many years previous to that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to weary the House too long this afternoon, but in concluding my remarks I wish to suggest that I am going to support the Motion, not that it is in itself an answer to all the problems which face us at the present time, nor that this Legislature, nor any one organization working within the economy of Saskatchewan could possibly hope to bring us a complete and total solution. But I do believe that, working along the trail which we have blazed in the past, by continuing to break new furrows of a similar type to those furrows which we broke in the last ten years, we may yet see the day in my time, if not in the time of some of the other members of this Legislature when we will in our own right and in our own way be able to control and formulate our own destiny, and that we will through that medium be able to bring to ourselves and to the generations which follow complete economic security and social justice.

Mr. W. J. Berezowsky (Cumberland): - Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly then adjourned at 5.20 o'clock p.m.